

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on October 11, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully considered.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 3 into independent form, canceled base claim 1, and has presented revised formal drawings. Claims 2 and 3 are the independent claims, and claims 2-4, 6-10 and 13 remain pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for various informalities. In response thereto, attached hereto are revised formal drawings, which more precisely show the features of the claimed invention. It is submitted that the drawings comply with all official requirements, and it is requested that these objections be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to claims 3 and 10 for using the term "another end." The Examiner's Action states that the term should be changed to "the other end." Although it is greatly appreciated that the Examiner has taken the time to provide such suggestions, it is believed that the original recitation better complies with the provisions of 35 USC, Section 112, Second Paragraph. That is, it is noted that the term "other end" does not have antecedent basis within the claim prior to the lines in which this term is initially presented. Thus, by changing the term "another end" to "the other end," Applicant will be introducing a term which does not have antecedent basis, thus potentially rendering the claims indefinite. It is thus requested that these objections be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected the claims under 35 USC, Section 112, First Paragraph. Initially, it is noted that some of the Examiner's confusion as to these claims could be due to the originally filed drawings. It is believed that the revised formal drawings, which are attached hereto, will help clarify some of the issues noted by the Examiner's Action. Further, it is also noted that with Applicant's last-filed Amendment, Applicant had attached a working model of the claimed multi-functional ladle. If the Examiner would study this model of the ladle, this ladle will show precisely to the Examiner how the invention operates, as well as the interrelationship between the various components. For example, it is clear from the model (as well as from the original disclosure) that the strainer ladle is invertible by moving the strainer ladle away from the ladle body so that it is no longer nested within the ladle body, and then simply by pivoting the strainer ladle, the strainer ladle can be inverted. This should be clearer by the new drawings, as well as by the model provided to the Examiner. Further, the Examiner's inquiry regarding the operation of the controlling device working or not with respect to the recitation in claim 2, appears to be due to a misunderstanding of the invention. That is, the claimed controlling device is used to separate the strainer ladle from the ladle body, by moving the strainer ladle in essentially an upward direction. Thus, the projection 12 on the bottom of the strainer ladle does not in any way impair the function of the controlling device. Again, this should be clear to the Examiner by studying the new formal drawings, as well the model previously submitted. Similarly, the other features that were not clear to the Examiner should be made more clear by reviewing the new drawings, as well as the model. It is

submitted that the claims comply with all provisions of 35 USC, Section 112, and it is requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

It is noted with great appreciation that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 19, 20 and 22 as being allowable over the art of record. As noted above, claims 2 and 3 have been amended into independent form. Further, claim 1 has been canceled, and claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 2. Thus, all of the Examiner's prior art rejections have been rendered moot, thus placing this application into condition for allowance. Such action, and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should any fee be required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert H. Berdo, Jr. – Reg. No. 38,075
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995
Telephone: 202-371-8976
Fax: 202-408-0924

December 5, 2007
Date

RHB/vm

AMENDMENT

10/565,266